REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated October 6, 2005, the Examiner states that Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22-29 are pending, Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected and Claims 22-29 are withdrawn. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite an anion and cation, to overcome this rejection.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected as obviousness-type double patenting in view of the Applicant's US Patent No. 6,773,801. The Applicants herewith submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome this rejection.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,210,787 (Goto et al.) in view of US 5,976,680 (Ikemori et al.) and US 5,880,557 (Endo et al.). The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the features of Claim 3, and considers that this amendment overcomes the rejections.

As described in amended Claim 1, the polymer electrolyte film used in the present invention is "provided as a multi-layered film that is made of not less than two kinds of polymer electrolytes and the polarity of the adjacent layers are different from each other". By providing such polymer electrolyte film, the charge density of the film surface can be made higher and more even. Moreover, because formation of unnecessary layers of fine particles, within a fine particle layer, can be prevented by using such polymer electrolyte film, an even single particle film can be formed.

The polymer electrolyte film having the above-mentioned effects requires both anionic polymer electrolyte and cationic polymer electrolyte. Therefore, the same effects cannot be obtained by using only an anionic electrolyte disclosed by Ikemori. Moreover, an electrostatic interaction is not mentioned by Endo, at all. For this reason, even if the fine particles which Endo teaches inherently have polarity, the same effects as the present invention cannot be obtained by merely coating these fine particles onto the material which Ikemori discloses. Furthermore, the present invention as claimed does not merely use a known electrostatic interaction. The present invention makes it possible to form an even single particle film easily by

using the polymer electrolyte film having much higher and more even charge density, in comparison with a substrate subjected to a surface treatment or the like.

As described above, the present invention has peculiar functions and effects so that the present invention is not obvious by combining the above-mentioned references. Therefore, the Applicant considers that the present invention as claimed is not obvious from a combination of the cited prior art references.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

April 5, 2006
Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613